



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

vicar-general of the diocese, and professor of Moral Theology (!) in the Great Seminary, who was at the time considerably in debt; the other, an Abbé Orceel, also belonging to the chapter. These priests have been throughout the principal promoters of the belief in the apparition, both by their personal influence and their writings. By sheer impudence and intolerance they have overcome the resistance of truth, conscience, and ridicule; and if they are not the real authors of the pantomime, they are, at least, responsible for the character it has assumed throughout the Romish Church."

Let us now, however, hear the other side. The *Tablet* of the 11th inst., admitting that not only unbelievers have justified their incredulity by the late judgment of the Imperial Court of Grenoble, but that some "pious souls" have been shaken in their belief by it, proceeds to re-assure the one and reply to the other; how, do our readers think? By a letter from the selfsame Bishop of Grenoble who has already been so deeply implicated in the affair, in which he sets up the old defence, the value of which is so well understood in the criminal courts, (in this country at least) *an alibi*! Not content, however, with this authoritative refutation of the civil tribunals by his lordship of Grenoble, the *Tablet* proceeds to prove that the Bishop of Grenoble is the only man living whose judgment in the matter is of the slightest value!!! The passage is a curiosity in its way, and we present it to our readers, as a specimen of that *clear and coercive* reasoning which the "faithful" are expected to find satisfactory and conclusive, if there were a hundred legal judgments to the contrary.

"The Abbé Duminy, S.T.D., writes in the *Rosier de Marie*, to remind us that in the miracle of La Salette there are involved two questions for Catholics—one of law and one of fact. The question of law is this. According to the sacred canons, what authority has to decide on the fact of the apparition of the ever-blessed Virgin at La Salette? The answer is, the Bishop of the Diocese. The fact of a supernatural apparition is not, according to the learned doctor, within the canon reserved to the Holy See, by the Fourth Council of Lateran.

"The prophecies uttered on the occasion are within the reservation, and have been referred to the Holy See; but the diocesan authority was competent to decide on the fact of the apparition, its decision being, of course liable to be reformed by the Holy See.

"The Council of Trent has indeed laid down that, should the bishop find the case too difficult, or be unwilling to take upon himself alone the canonical decision of the question, recourse may be had to the Metropolitan, or even to a provincial council. But where the bishop assumes to decide on his own authority, he is a competent judge. Such being the law, the question of fact simply is (not whether the apparition was a reality or an imposture, but) has the Bishop of Grenoble decided, and what is his decision?"

We wonder whether this sort of reasoning does really satisfy the readers of the *Tablet*; and we should be greatly obliged to any of our Roman Catholic friends who would inform us whether the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Grenoble extends to Ireland? We rather opine that if the Bishop had been a less easily duped old gentleman, and had referred the case to his metropolitan, the *Cardinal de Bonald*,<sup>b</sup> the decision would have been the exact opposite of that of his more credulous suffragan. But the *Tablet* proceeds:—

"The Bishop of Grenoble has decided,—and his canonical decision was published on the 19th September, 1851 (i.e., observe, five years before the exposure before the civil tribunals)—in these terms:—'We declare, seeing the impossibility of explaining the fact of Salette otherwise than by the Divine intervention, that the apparition of the Blessed Virgin to the two shepherds bears in itself

all the characters of truth, and that the faithful are warranted in believing it indubitable and certain.'

"After this," adds the *Tablet*, "nothing was left for those who denied but recourse to Rome."

We think the writer might have added, or to disbelieve it, if they were not convinced! for we see nothing in the decision to *coerce* any one to believe it, especially after the possibility of explaining it otherwise was legally proved, though the Bishop *authorised* them to believe it if so inclined—i.e., gave them the sanction of his opinion for so doing.

"But Rome has not reformed the canonical judgment of the Bill of Grenoble. It, therefore, remains in full power. What results? Simply this—that the faithful are warranted in believing the apparition of the Blessed Virgin at La Salette to be indubitable and certain."

The faithful must be *simple*, indeed, if they are satisfied with such a *warranty* as a substitute for proof. We should like to know whether there are three sane men of ordinary education in the whole of Ireland who believe in the apparition. Will any of our readers say that they do so?

We have received a letter from a Mr. Bourke, containing some strictures upon the charge of the Archdeacon of Middlesex, extracts from which we reprinted in our last number. Mr. Bourke seems to think that his communication would severely test the *bona fides* of our invitations to give a reasonable space to the communications of (R.) Catholics on subjects of controversy. We can assure Mr. Bourke the *bona fides* of our invitation has stood much more trying tests than anything contained in his letter. Our reason for not inserting it "in its integrity," as he desires, is, simply, that it is so full of offensive language as to be quite unsuitable to our pages. Mr. Bourke, who appears to be very sensitive to what he calls the *unseemly rudeness* of most Protestant writers in using such "vulgar phrases" as Papist, Romanist, Popery, and the like, ought to remember that those who differ with him may possibly also have some feelings capable of being hurt, and that no decently conducted journal could, consistently with self-respect, publish, under the pretext of argument, such vituperation against the founders of the Reformed Churches as is contained in his letter. If Mr. Bourke thinks it argument to call the Reformers "the miscreant founders of Protestantism," "wicked apostates," "foul and polluted with every crime," and to impute to them indiscriminately and without a particle of proof, "sacrilege," "murder," "incest," "robbery;" in short, to use Mr. Bourke's own words, "every guilt in the black and gloomy catalogue of crime which could shock and appal an affrighted world by its hideous deformity," we can only say that such is not the *kind of argument* which we are accustomed to, or which shall ever, with our consent, find admission into our pages. We have always freely opened our columns to Roman Catholics who are able to defend their opinions in a manner worthy of serious attention, but expect them to conduct the discussion in the spirit of gentlemanly courtesy, avoiding needless offence towards those who differ with them.

We regret this the more in the present instance, as there are parts of Mr. Bourke's letter which we would readily have inserted if they had not been accompanied with such offensive phraseology as we have above referred to.

### Correspondence.

#### ON THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—To vindicate myself from the charge of "subtlety, hair-splitting," &c., preferred against me, in reply to my letter (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, June, 1857, pages 69, 70), as also to establish the *inconsistency* of your attempts to explain the invocation of saints, I need only refer to the unanswered, and unanswerable, arguments stated in my letter now referred to, and in the letter in the CATHOLIC

LAYMAN, May, 1857, page 58—arguments, for the most part, drawn from your own statements, fairly and accurately cited, and of which I may safely and fearlessly challenge you to point out any one of the numerous passages, nay, a single word, in these numerous citations, which I have diverted from the sense in which you penned it. A few brief observations will show that the cracked "*china vase*" is justly descriptive of your impotent attempts to decry the value of my arguments. In CATHOLIC LAYMAN, April, 1856, page 46, you concede that the words, "*for obtaining benefits from God*" are "*the material words*" which qualify the invocation of saints. You grant that "the way in which either the saints or we can obtain anything from God" is "by the Lord Jesus;" and whether we, without the saints, pray to God for benefits, &c., or whether we ask the saints to join with us, or to procure them for us, you grant the way is the same; "as to which," you say, "*there was no dispute whatever*;" adding, "the only dispute is, whether dead men should be invoked or prayed to in any way;" so that your *first version* of this dogma is that we invoke the saints (dead men) as joint supplicants with us to obtain benefits from God, through Christ Jesus. This, you grant, was fairly our practice in April, 1856. Your *second version* of our practice is that we retain the worship of God, but not the mediation of Christ; and that we invoke the Blessed Virgin and the saints as our mediators, &c.; for, in No. for March, 1857, page 28, you make the Romanist say, "Christ is too high—too holy, for us, sinful creatures, to approach;" with respect to which, you significantly ask him (the Romanist), "but is He not the intercessor who is to plead on behalf of sinners like us? Does He not invite all to come to Him, saying, Come to Me ALL you that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest? And does He not promise, Him that cometh to Me I will not cast off?" "True, says the Romanist" (so pointedly do you make him reject the mediation of Christ), "but He is so far removed from us by His supreme divinity, that we require some one who approaches nearer to our own nature, who can inspire us with greater confidence, and to whom we can have access without that fear which we naturally feel in the Divine presence." Now, the very nature of these interrogatories, and the reply, so artfully shaped, suitably thereto, establish the fact that you endeavour to make your readers believe that the poor Romanist does hold Christ to be his mediator with God, that he does not come to Him, that he does not ask His intercession; but that he has greater confidence in the mediation of others. Add to this the numerous proofs given in No. for June, 1857, page 69.

Your *third version* of our practice is afforded by your famous "*Illustration*" (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, April, 1857, page 46), which I fully considered and refuted (No. for May, 1857, page 58). By this illustration you make it appear that we have exploded the worship of God and of Christ, and that we worship and invoke the Blessed Virgin and saints as gods, and instead of the true God.

Your *fourth version* of our practice is from this illustration with an amendment (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, May, 1857, page 59), by which you contradict the last version, asserting that "*the queen has a choice*," &c., insinuating thereby that we offer a hypocritical worship to God, holding, at the same time, that the *real power* to dispense grace, assistance, &c., rests with the saints, in the same manner as the candidate for the ribbon holds that "the real power rests with the minister," offering the queen an outward show of respect only, by attending her levees, &c. Here, then, we have four irreconcilable and conflicting versions of our practice of the invocation of saints; a fact which you do not attempt to deny; but, on the contrary, you candidly admit that such is the case; for, in order to save appearances with your readers, and, as it were, to account for these discrepancies, you tell them "that if any *inconsistency* exists, the fault is not in you, but in the doctrines of which you had to give an account."—(CATHOLIC LAYMAN, June, 1857, page 70, col. 2.) And further, you tell them—"The substance of Mr. Power's charge of inconsistency is this—that we have acknowledged that Roman Catholics do not repudiate the worship of God and of Christ; that, in point of fact, they actually do make prayers to Christ, as Roman Catholic prayer-books testify; and that this is inconsistent with our charge that they seek for other mediators through whom to have access to God and to him." Thus do you endeavour, by stating a fifth inconsistency, to account for the four inconsistencies which I have just noticed. I have shown my charge of inconsistency to refer solely to the contradictory and palpably incorrect versions of the invocation of saints which I stated now in consecutive order, and which I have over and over again shown to be inevitably patent in your attempts to explain away this Catholic dogma. The sum of my charge of inconsistency is found in these heterogeneous explanations of our doctrine; and hence, "the substance of Mr. Power's charge of inconsistency," &c., is no better than a *common artifice* to lead away your readers from the consideration of the real charge of inconsistency. Let your readers compare the statement which you tell them is the substance of Mr. Power's charge of inconsistency with your other four versions given above, and they may in vain seek for any kindred relation of principles; they will find it impossible, even by "*subtlety, hair-splitting, and dove-tailing*," to reconcile it to any one of them, or to all of them together. These discordant attempts are really ada-

<sup>a</sup> The wealth which has since flowed in upon M. Rousselot and his colleagues, from the success of the affair, appears to be immense. So far back as June, 1850, M. Melin, Curé of Corps, admitted to the Bishop of Gap that he had received 40,000 francs for the water he had sold. Since then the traffic is considerably increased, and the public conveyances are laden with it. It is now estimated that, including the sale of medals, images, trinkets, books, masses, and holy water, the Apparition brings in from 200,000 to 300,000 francs a year.

<sup>b</sup> See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Vol. II., p. 43, where we gave the letter of the Cardinal.

manlike obains in which you are inextricably fettered. The practice of Roman Catholic prayer-books is, that Christ alone is our mediator, and that all our prayers, whether of ourself separately, or conjointly with the saints, as fellow-brethren, and members of our communion, are offered through Him to the Father. This alone is our practice, warranted by the authority of our prayer-books, where it is further shown that all our invocations to the saints to "pray for us" (for beyond this we do not invoke them) are offered up through Christ Jesus to God the Father, just as we ask our brethren on earth to pray for us; and hence, your saying that we "seek for other mediators through whom to have access to God and to Christ" is a decided proof that you do not understand the doctrine which you have undertaken to explain, as such an assertion is utterly at variance not alone with common sense, but likewise with the practice of Roman Catholic prayer-books.

The passages adduced by me from your own statements respecting our practice, as cited in the Nos. for May and June last, are unimpeachable evidence against you. They are correctly cited, and their result, which I have now briefly analysed—the four discordant definitions of the invocation of saints—are lasting monuments of the inefficiency of your speculations to explain away our real belief. When you come to understand this subject properly, and to state it fairly, and according to the practice of our prayer-books, then it will be easy to establish the propriety of it; and until you do this, it is manifest, from your unsettled and indefinite views of the subject, that all you have said thereon is perfectly irrelevant.

When I find you treating the subject on its intrinsic merits, by fairly admitting our principles, I shall undertake to prove that the doctrine contained in the Glories of Mary, making allowance for figurative language, has nothing in it derogatory to the worship of God and the religion of the Bible.

On the part not alone of the priests of Ireland, but of myself and my lay brethren, I beg you will be kind enough, as you deny (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, June, 1857, page 66) that the Greek *Θεοτόκος*, or its equivalent, *Θεοπαρά*, in Latin, is to be rendered in English, Mother of God, to explain by what other English equivalent it is to be justly expressed, and what is the proper and indispensable acceptance thereof.

I am, Sir, &c.,

EDMOND POWER.

We dare say the majority of our readers agree with us in thinking Mr. Power's letters very hard reading; and we do not know whether it is not designedly they are so. For as those who take their religion from the Bible are in the habit of thinking it a very plain matter that the Roman Catholic practice of invocation of saints is absolutely irreconcilable with Scripture, Mr. Power's purpose is sufficiently answered if he can make his readers suppose that the doctrine of his Church on this subject is something abstruse, and beyond the powers of a man of ordinary capacity to understand, much less to venture to pass sentence of condemnation on.

There are, however, one or two statements in his letter which, we think, will enable us to bring our difference with him to a point. He says, in the first place, the "practice of Roman Catholic prayer-books is that Christ alone is our mediator." We are very sure that when he is called to account for this statement he will be forced to explain it away, or to prove that he used the words in a non-natural sense; for it is not either the doctrine or the practice of the Church of Rome that Christ alone is our mediator. Observe, the question is not whose mediation the *Virgin* or the *saints* may employ in approaching to God; but whose mediation are *we* to employ? And, certainly, if the Church of Rome teaches that we are to use the mediation of Christ, she does not teach that we are to trust to that alone. We repeat an extract from Liguori, given already, p. 59:—"Says Arnoldus, we can go with confidence to God, and hope all good from Him, now that the Son is a mediator before the Father, and that the Mother is an advocate with the Son. How can the Father refuse to hear the Son, when He exhibits the wounds that He suffered for sinners, and how can the Son refuse to hear the Mother, when she shows Him the breasts that gave Him suck."

Who does not perceive that while Protestants are taught that the meanest believer may approach with full confidence in His sympathy, and love, and willingness to hear, the teaching of this extract is that we need an advocate with the Son, and that we are recommended, instead of addressing ourselves to Him directly, to use the mediation of one "about whom there is nothing to excite terror."

Mr. Power says, secondly, that "beyond asking the saints to pray for us we do not invoke them." We have already proved that this is not the case. We have cited prayers in which the Virgin Mary is directly asked for protection; and we have shown that such prayers are in accordance with the decrees of the Council of Trent, which approve of our having recourse not only to the intercession of the saints, but to their help and assistance (*opem auxilium et intercessionem*). Mr. Power answers us by producing other Roman Catholic prayers to God or to the saints in which the saints' protection is not asked for. This is the old defence of the prisoner who confuted the testimony of the half dozen witnesses who did see him commit the crime by the testimony of half a hundred who did not see him committing it.

Mr. Power, in conclusion, postpones his defence of the Glories of Mary, and of the propriety of Roman Catholic practices, until we come to understand this subject properly. We do not wonder at Mr. Power wishing for a long day before undertaking the defence of such extracts as we have given; for we suppose it would be a long time before Mr. Power would admit that we understood the subject properly. As persons, however, who with a very sincere desire to learn the truth—and we flatter ourselves with ordinary power of comprehension—have given no little attention to Roman Catholic writings on this subject, we are entitled to say, that if we do not understand those doctrines by this time, the fault is in the doctrines and not in us. We believe the real cause of complaint is, that we understand the doctrines a great deal too well, so that the evasions with which we are attempted to be put off will not pass current with us.

As, however, Mr. Power asserts that we do not understand Roman Catholic doctrine, and as religious truth is the object of discussion in our pages, we ask Mr. Power, if that be his object also, to tell us in plain words what the doctrine of the Church of Rome about invocation of saints is? If he will give us a plain statement of the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this subject, then we apprehend that his correspondence will speedily become very much clearer to our readers than it is at present. But if Mr. Power will not give us such a statement, he is not in a position to discuss the subject with us. We, therefore, propose it as a condition of the admission of future letters from him upon the subject he has written so often about, that he will give us an explicit statement of the doctrine of the Church of Rome concerning the invocation of saints. We will try that statement by the standard writers of his own Church; and we, therefore, may reasonably require that it should be full and explicit.

With respect to the word *Θεοτόκος*, Mr. Power, of course, understands, from the article in our last number, that it was not one of the ordinary words of the Greek language. For 1000 years, at least, the Greek language had no such word. The ordinary words of one language are easily translated into another language. If the Greek Fathers had said *Θεου Μητήρ*, we should have had no difficulty in saying that "Mother of God" was the English of that. But the Greek Fathers *durst* not say *Θεου μητήρ*; so they coined a new word, *Θεοτόκος*. The Greek language had a power of coining new words, which the English language has not; there is no one English word for *Θεοτόκος*; but its meaning can be expressed in English—"The bringer forth of God." The word was intended to express, that He whom the Virgin brought forth was God. The creating of this new word, instead of calling the Virgin *Θεου μητήρ* (Mother of God), was intended to exclude any idea that the Virgin had any subsequent authority over Him as his mother. The word was framed to express that He whom she brought forth was God; and, at the same time, to mark the absence of the maternal authority expressed in the word "Mother;" the word expresses the mere fact of the birth, and *excludes* every other idea.

We beg to refer Mr. Power to the article in our last number, in proof that, whatever the merits of the word *Θεοτόκος* may be, the Council of Ephesus did not adopt the word, and the Church is in no way responsible for it.

#### THE RED SCAPULAR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

YOUR HONOUR.—I had to be in Navan, in this county of Meath, afore Whitsuntide, doing some business, and as I was lodging in a house for the night, I slept along with a man I met betimes before; and he's a mighty devout man, and always going to the priest, and looking for what is good for his soul; and as we were going to bed I thought I would have a little talk with him, because the way of my business brings me in with a deal of people, and so I come to know as much of the people's minds as many another man. Well, while I was thinking what to talk about, as he was undressing, I sees round his neck a little bit of red cloth, and something on it, and two red strings tying it; and I didn't know what it meant, because I never saw the like before, though I have seen a deal of things of that sort. So I asked him what it was; and when he was hiding it, I said "Sure you wouldn't be ashamed of it whatever it is, and I'll say nothing but what's civil and friendly about it." Well, with that he says "It's a scapular, it is." "It's not," says I. "It is," says he, "and the best of scapulars." "It's not," says I; "didn't I see many a scapular, and sure every scapular is black or brown." "This one isn't," says he. "And why isn't it," says I? "Because it's a red one," says he. "And why is it red," says I? "Because the red one gets more indulgences for the soul than the black one," says he. "Do you tell me that now?" says I. "It's as true as that I'm a Catholic," says he. "And why did I never hear of a Red Scapular before?" says I. "Because it's not long come out," says he. "And who brought it out?" says I. "His Holiness the Pope," says he, "and Father Grimley." "And where's the like of this to be got?" says I. Well, that he wouldn't tell me, whatever reason he had; but there was a great mission of the Jesuits going on in Navan that same time, and I wonder would they have

anything to do with the like. Well, I coasted out of him what the Red Scapular is good for; and it bear all ever you heard to hear him talk of all the indulgences the Pope has given to them that wears the Red Scapular. Didn't I lie awake all night trying to count it up; and didn't it bother me entirely, though I'm pretty good at the figures, that is, in reason. Such nonsense I never heard; and I thought I would write to your honour, and ask is the Pope putting that on us in earnest as our religion?

Now, I do declare, your honour, it's no lie about the Red Scapular; for I'm in dread somebody will say it's making stories I am.

Your honour's servant,

PADDY REILLY, of Meath.

[On receiving Pat Reilly's letter, we sent to our Roman Catholic bookseller for information, who is always kindly ready to afford it to us; on our paying for the book. He has sent us a little book which explains all that Paddy Reilly saw and heard. The title of the book is as follows: "Devotions, Indulgences, and Advantages of the Scapular of the Passion; with Meditations for every day. By the Rev. Thomas Grimley; Dedicated to the Missionaries of St. Vincent de Paul. Fourth Edition, permissu superiorum. Dublin: Richardson and Son, 9, Capel-street; 172, Fleet-street; London, and Derby."

The Rev. Thomas Grimley is curate to the Very Rev. Dr. Yore, of the great Roman Catholic Chapel on Arranquay, Dublin; and Dr. Yore is Vicar-General to Archbishop Cullen: it is, therefore, natural that Mr. Grimley's book should be published "permissu superiorum," that is, "by permission of superiors."

According to the laws of the Roman Catholic Church, it belongs to Archbishop Cullen to give that permission. Mr. Grimley's book has, therefore, great authority.

Mr. Grimley states that this little book was first printed with red ink, but that being found bad for sore eyes, it is now printed in black. But red copies can still be had by those who prefer them.

Some of Mr. Grimley's introductory remarks are such as we entirely agree in—for instance, "The Passion of the Redeemer seems to have been ever present to the mind of St. Paul; 'God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified to me, and I to the world;' and again, 'I judged not myself to know anything among you but Jesus Christ, and Him crucified.'" page 6. . . "The great St. Augustine assures us that nothing is so profitable as daily to think how much Jesus has suffered for us—He who is both God and Man;" page 7. . . "Let us assure ourselves that if we adopt the same means the saints did, we will experience the same happy results,"—page 8.

We need hardly say that in such sentiments we entirely concur with Mr. Grimley, however we may be obliged to differ with him as to the best way of putting them in practice.

For instance, when Mr. Grimley says (page 6), "The peculiar mode of honouring the passion of Christ, as set forth in this little treatise, is new, but daily meditation on our Lord's sufferings is as old as Christianity;" we cannot but think that "if we adopt the same means the saints did," we should keep to "daily meditation on our Lord's sufferings," and let alone this "peculiar mode" which "the saints" never used, and which Mr. Grimley confesses to be "new."

Very new, indeed, it is; just TEN YEARS OLD, on the 25th of last month.

But we have a yet stronger objection to this "peculiar mode of honouring the Passion of Christ" than its novelty. Fully concurring in Mr. Grimley's desire to honour that passion, and giving him credit for sincerity in that desire, and rejoicing if his book should stir up any hearts with a like desire, we must still think that, upon his own showing, the "Red Scapular" is based entirely upon delusion and imposture, and we think that it is dishonouring to our Lord that delusion and imposition should be represented as the best and "newest" means of honouring His passion. And we think, too, that a religion which leads sincere men to adopt such means for such an object, must be itself imbued with a spirit of falsehood, and have a most hardening effect upon the conscience.

To justify these remarks, we give Mr. Grimley's own account of the "ORIGIN OF THIS DEVOTION." We give all the facts stated by Mr. Grimley, and in his own words (p. 11, &c.).

"On the 28th of July, 1846, while Sister W—, a member of the community of the Sisters of Charity, was in the chapel, pouring forth her pious aspirations before her Divine Lord, she felt convinced that our Saviour appeared to her in a vision. He seemed to hold in his right hand a SCARLET SCAPULAR, suspended by two woollen strings of the same colour. Upon one side of the scapular our Saviour was represented hanging upon the cross; beneath the cross were the instruments of His most sorrowful passion; the scourge, hammer, spear, the pillar at which He was scourged, the vessel containing the most bitter draught, and the robe which had covered His bleeding body! Round the crucifix were inscribed these words: 'Sacred Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, save us! At the other end of the string was a piece of the same